

Appl. No.: 10/623,091
Reply to Office Action of: June 29, 2004

Remarks

Claims 1-9 are pending in this application. The following remarks are addressed to the referenced paragraphs of the Office Action dated June 29, 2004.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 USC 102

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, and 9 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Billman et al. (US 5,443,394). Claim 1 is canceled herein. Claim 2 has been amended to be in independent form. Applicants respectfully contend that claim 2, as amended, is allowable because it includes a feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references, namely "a cam protrusion provided on a bottom wall of the main body." The office action argues that support surface 32 of Billman et al. is a cam protrusion provided on a bottom wall of the main body. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cam of the present invention is a sliding cam, wherein a slider 54 slides in a horizontal direction. When the slider 54 moves horizontally, the engaging a cam protrusion 74 deflects the slider 54 vertically, pressing a plate 76 against a card to prevent extraction of the card. In sharp contrast, Billman discloses a rotating cam wherein a lock lever 50 is rotated to deflect a latch beam 20 so that a projection 26 on the latch beam 20 engages an apertures 2 in the circuit card (Col. 4, lines 15-41). As clearly pointed out in Billman et al. (Col. 4, lines 59-67), the support surfaces 32 slidably support the lock lever restraining the lock lever 50 in the vertical direction. The support surfaces do not cause the deflection of the latch beam, and therefore are not cam protrusions.

Moreover, the latch projection 26 of Billman et al. prevent extraction of the card by engagement with an aperture in the card (Col. 5, lines 40-46). Thus, Billman et al. fail to disclose or suggest a frictional retention member.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully contend that claim 2, as amended, is allowable.

Appl. No.: 10/623,091
Reply to Office Action of: June 29, 2004

Claims 4-5, 7, and 9 depend from claim 2 and Applicants respectfully contend that they are allowable for the reasons that claim 2 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully contend that claims 4 and 5 are allowable for the further reason that the cited references do not disclose or suggest that the frictional retention member is formed from rubber. The office action suggests that Billman discloses a friction member 26 formed from rubber, but such disclosure could not be found in Billman et al., and Applicants respectfully contend that Billman et al. does not disclose a frictional retention member formed from rubber.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's acknowledgement of allowable subject matter in claims 3, 6, and 8. Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form as suggested by the Examiner, and Applicants respectfully contend that claim 3 now stands in condition for allowance. Claims 6 and 8 depend from claim 3, and Applicants respectfully contend that they are allowable for the reasons that claim 3 is allowable.

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, and in view of the amendments herein, Applicants respectfully contend that claims 2-9 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments contained herein, allowance of claims 2-9 and issuance of letters patent for the present invention.

Respectfully submitted,


Steven E. Bach
Registration No. 46,530
Attorney for Applicants
Phone: (610) 889-3697
Facsimile: (610) 889-3696

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.